

REMARKS

Claims 21, 38 and 49 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-60 are pending.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

The claims of this application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-60 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Cho *et al.* (USP 6,834,048). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cho discloses a VOIP telephone system which allows a computer user to call through a computer to a telephone call recipient. Only two devices are involved in the teachings of Cho, a computer and the recipient's telephone or computer. As disclosed in Cho, Cho

provides audio communication between a personal computer 11 and an audio communication device 14. In operation, a local caller using computer 11, equipped with a sound card and headset, for example, uses a web browser to access and log onto web site 16 of an internet telephone service provider. After logging-on, the local caller provides the phone number of regular telephone 14 to web site 16, which then directs an Internet Telephone Service Provider (ITSP) gateway 12 to provide a voice connection between computer 11 and telephone 14.

Cho:3:6-15.

All of the independent claims, namely claims 1, 21, 33, 37, 38, 41, 49 and 57, recite a toolbar or toolbar software, a computing device, a first telephone and a second telephone.

We respectfully remind the examiner that each and every one of the claimed limitations must be disclosed in the cited reference for a § 102 anticipation rejection. MPEP 2131. Cho fails to disclose all of the claimed limitations. As such, all of the claims are patentable over Cho. The following paragraphs set forth specifically how Cho fails to disclose each and every one of the claimed limitations.

Cho fails to teach a system that involves three devices as claimed. All of the independent claims recite a computing device, a first telephone and a second telephone. Cho is limited to a system that involves two devices. Cho's system involves a computer from which a telephone call is placed and the recipient's telephone or computer. This is made clear at 3:6-15 (quoted above). As such, Cho fails to teach a system that involves three devices as claimed.

In addition, claims 1, 33, 37, 41 and 57 explicitly recite a two leg call between a predefined telephone number and the activated telephone number wherein the predefined telephone number is associated with a first telephone distinct from the computing device that runs the Internet web browser, and wherein the activated telephone number is associated with a second telephone distinct from the computing device and distinct from the first telephone. Cho fails to teach the claimed two leg telephone call. That is, as claimed, the two leg call is initiated from a computer or computing device, but the two leg call is between a first telephone and a second telephone wherein the first telephone is distinct from the computing device that runs the Internet web browser, and wherein the activated telephone number is associated with the second telephone distinct from the computing device and distinct from the first telephone. Cho does not teach such a two leg call.

Further, Cho fails to teach a toolbar of any kind. Cho is limited to teaching a web browser. The teaching of an Internet web browser in no way teaches a toolbar that operates in or in conjunction with an Internet web browser.

In view of the prior paragraphs, Cho fails to teach all of the limitations recited in the independent claims. Therefore, all of the independent claims, and all claims depending thereon, are patentable over Cho. As such, all claims are patentable over Cho and this rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, independent claims 21 and 49 recite, among other limitations, in pertinent part, “the toolbar software scanning the web page data for associated data items included in an address book stored on the computing device and included with or accessible to the toolbar”, “identifying the associated data items found in the web page data as found data items” and “pairing a telephone number from the address book with each of the found data items”, as well as other actions involving “associated data items” and an “address book”. And independent claim 38 recites, among other limitations, the toolbar software “identifying telephone numbers in the web page data as identified telephone numbers”, “looking up the identified telephone numbers in an address book stored on the computing device to create a found telephone numbers list” and “altering the normal display of at least one of the found telephone numbers to make the found telephone number conspicuous on the web page in which the found telephone number is included”.

Claims 21, 38 and 49 have been amended to further specify that the address book is stored on the computing device. The cited portion of Cho merely shows a yellow pages web site search results page. (Cho FIGS. 5A and 5B, 6:36-40) Cho does not teach “an address book stored on the computing device” as claimed. As such, Cho fails to teach all of the limitations recited in independent claims 21, 38 and 49. Therefore, claims 21, 38 and 49 and all claims depending thereon are patentable over Cho.

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned registered practitioner to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Goldstein
Reg. No. 50,759

Date: December 17, 2008

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350 x240
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: mgoldstein@socalip.com